Ham-Policy Digest   Wed, 9 Nov 94   Volume 94 : Issue 524

Today's Topics:
                     10 WPM Generals? (3 msgs)
                          Best FTP sites?

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 5 Nov 1994 21:45:49 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: 10 WPM Generals?

Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:

>Quote from Sept 94 Radio Fun
>
>"Slow-code" is the name given to an Amateur Radio Industry Association
>proposal to lower the General Class code speed requirement to 10 words
>per minute. So far, it has gained far more support than criticism in
>ham radio circles... An unofficial pole being conducted by Newsline is
>so far five-to-one in favor... from TNX Westlink Report, No. 673
>
>EndQuote;

So 10wpm = `slowcode' and yet on here on .policy 13wpm = `high speed'?
Is there no middle ground?

>If 62% of hams don't use CW,

I've been asking every CW operator I encounter whether they use CW - my
poll shows that 100% of them use it.

A better poll would be to ask all regular HF operators what percentage
of time they spend on the various HF modes.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 8 Nov 1994 05:23:39 GMT
From: billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake)
Subject: 10 WPM Generals?

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:
: Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:

: >Quote from Sept 94 Radio Fun
: >"Slow-code" is the name given to an Amateur Radio Industry Association
: >proposal to lower the General Class code speed requirement to 10 words
: >per minute. So far, it has gained far more support than criticism in
: >ham radio circles... An unofficial pole being conducted by Newsline is
: >so far five-to-one in favor... from TNX Westlink Report, No. 673
: >
: >EndQuote;

So how does one contact the Amateur Radio Industry Association?

: So 10wpm = `slowcode' and yet on here on .policy 13wpm = `high speed'?
: Is there no middle ground?

: >If 62% of hams don't use CW,
:
: I've been asking every CW operator I encounter whether they use CW - my
: poll shows that 100% of them use it.

: A better poll would be to ask all regular HF operators what percentage
: of time they spend on the various HF modes.

Fair enough, to a point, but all amateurs and non-amateurs
alike should certainly participate in any dialog with the FCC
on any proposed changes.

For the HF enabled, let me provide my HF stats:

CW - None, haven't had a CW QSO since the 50s.

SSB - Almost 100% except for below.

FM - Some (very little, but some never-the-less, on 10 meter rptrs.

--
Bill Sohl K2UNK   (billsohl@planet.net)
Budd Lake, New Jersey

Date: 6 Nov 1994 04:34:50 GMT
From: wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner)
Subject: 10 WPM Generals?

In article <CytDsE.99z@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
>So 10wpm = `slowcode' and yet on here on .policy 13wpm = `high speed'?
>Is there no middle ground?

Sure. 11.5 wpm... :-)

>I've been asking every CW operator I encounter whether they use CW - my
>poll shows that 100% of them use it.
>
>A better poll would be to ask all regular HF operators what percentage
>of time they spend on the various HF modes.

It depends what you want to show. If you think the opinions of all hams
are important, then just asking HF operators what they think is
definitely not right.

I believe the 62% number is probably a good indicator (considering it
was found before the no-code technicians joined our ranks, so all those
questioned (or nearly all) had passed a code test) of what you're trying
to show. (Or rather, what the anti-code-testing group is trying to
show.) At least it was in the form of a scientific survey...

Date: Tue, 8 Nov 1994 15:20:20 GMT
From: prs@hk.net (Pierre R. Schwob)
Subject: Best FTP sites?

In article <941103.071339.3m2.rusnews.w165w@dvss.UUCP> dvss!jtroy@louie.udel.edu
(Jay Troy) writes:
>Which are the best radio/ham/mods/freqs/etc FTP sites?

For one, try hk.net (/shareware/prs)
That's the home of the ID LOGIC SW Simulator,

and the World Clock.

_____
Pierre R. Schwob
prs@hk.net

Date: Sat, 5 Nov 1994 21:50:12 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<102794072745Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> <38rm5k$3hb@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
<1994Nov2.022732.8616@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Reply-To: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu
Subject: Speed limits (was: Kindness and ham radio)

In article <1994Nov2.022732.8616@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary
Coffman) writes:

>Ah, but that's where you move off into fantasyland. Since most
>people *don't* obey the arbitrarily low speed limits, how do you
>propose to make them change?

And if the posted speed limit was 75 everyone would be driving 85. We're
going to push the speed limit no matter what it is.

If you want to hire nationwide road crews to insure there are no mattresses,
mufflers, animal carcasses and other debris on *all* highways so no
sudden swerving nor quick breaking actions are necessary, *and* place
an upper age limit on highway driving (since the older folks' reaction
times are diminished), *and* give life terms to those who drive while
under the influence of alcohol or drugs (life terms since if they
do it once they'll certainly do it again), *and* meter all onramps,
and place an upper limit on the number of vehicles on the roads
at any given time since there is only a finite number of highway
miles and we're supposed to remain one carlength for every 10mph
behind others, *and* control the climate so as to insure no ice nor
rain runnoff mixed with oil byproducts nor high winds (California's
Grapevine comes to mind) exist, *and* _____ (someone
else continue this very long sentence), *then* maybe you can discuss
higher speed limits.

>The interstates were designed for a 70 MPH speed with 1950s vehicles
>and suspensions.
>That's reflected in the 1000 foot minimum radius for
>turns, the 3% maximum grades, the angle of bank in turns, and a host of
>other design factors. With modern vehicles and suspensions, the natural
>limit is even higher.

1950's vehicles and 1990's trucks, unless you're planning on banning
all commercial trucking from the highways. Trucks are dangerously top-
heavy (especially those with phased CB antennas on the mirrors), and
are not well-maintained. Allow them higher speeds with today's highways
and watch the fun. But of course, in this dream of yours, you're not
going to have a seperate speed limit for trucks now, are you? That
would be dangerous to the high speed passenger vehicles. Were you
planning on rerouting commercial trucking off these high speed
highways? If so, are you prepared for higher prices at the grocery
stores?

>Cover the speedometer, and people will drive at the natural speed
>of the road.

Then count the bodies along the curves from those who have spun out.

You live in a dream world, Gary. I've already told you of the sights
I've witnessed on the highways as a fireman. Do I need to remind you
what a body looks like after it's gone through a windshield at 80mph,
flown through the air and then skidded on the pavement 100 feet?

I invite you to spend a day with your Georgia Highway Patrol, and
while your riding with them ask them about the highspeed training
they've received; then ponder the cost of having every driving
citizen in the US undergo that same highspeed training.

Let's make a deal: Highspeed driving if, and only if (Halmos: iff)
highspeed code exams for HF access.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 8 Nov 1994 15:35:32 GMT
From: bill@triangle.cs.uofs.edu (Bill Gunshannon)

References<Cypy7w.J9s@news.Hawaii.Edu> <39dksh$nld@paperboy.gsfc.nasa.gov>,
<CyuFKA.JrI@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject: Re: 5wpm in 5days (or your money back!)

In article <CyuFKA.JrI@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
|> Erich Franz Stocker <stocker@spsosun.gsfc.nasa.gov> writes:
|>
|> >jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu writes:
|>
|> >> Five days to get to 5wpm? I guess that just about kills the ``It's

```
|> >> too difficult'' argument!
|>
|> >Jeff don't think you have been following that argument well.  The
|> >ease or difficulty of learning code and getting up to speed are
|> >solely individual dependent not some constant value.
|>
|> Well Erich, for over two years I have placed myself in the middle
|> of the argument, and many in the nocode camp have shown they don't
|> want to learn code because it's too difficult.
|> But, *no one* is lacking the ability to learn 5wpm
|> (the dots and dashes can be written down at that speed then decoded)

And a number of VE's here have already said they would fail anyone who did that.

So what's your point??


|>
|> I've said that while I was attending USCG Radioman's school those
|> unable to pass the 22wpm speed were a tiny fraction of those who
|> passed. The students were folks off the street with no particular
|> love nor hate of Morse.

And back in the 60's when I was at the Army Radio Operators School (2 of
them as a matter of fact.  One at Ft. Dix and the other at Ft. Gordon) I
had a chance to observe a lot of people trying to get up to the roaring
speed of 10 WPM.  The failure rate was very high, with many not even
mastering the alphabet, much less working on speed.  Now, let's consider
the incentive.  Those that failed could easily find themselves becoming
11B - Infantryman or 11C - Mortarman and at that time, on a fast plane to
Vietnam.  Seems like a pretty good incentive me.  A lot stronger than the
desire to work Burkino-Fasso on 40 meters.  So then, how do all the "it was
easy for me, it must be easy for you" advocate explain it??
Oh, and I wasn't one of the flunkouts.  I was high-speed qualified and spent
12 of my 15 years in the Army as a Radio Operator of one kind or another.

   bill  KB3YV

--
Bill Gunshannon        |   de-moc-ra-cy (di mok' ra see) n.  Three wolves
bill@cs.uofs.edu       |   and a sheep voting on what's for dinner.
University of Scranton  |
Scranton, Pennsylvania  |        #include <std.disclaimer.h>


------------------------------

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #524
*****************************
```